



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Pat nt and Trad mark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/213,581	12/17/98	LYS	I CKC-012.07

CHARLES H CELLA
PATENT GROUP
FOLEY HOAG & ELIOT
ONE POST OFFICE SQUARE
BOSTON MA 02109-2170

MMC1/1004

EXAMINER

LEE, W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2821

DATE MAILED: 10/04/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/213,581

Applicant(s)
Lys et al.

Examiner
Wilson Lee

Group Art Unit
2821



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 17, 2000

☐ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application

Of the above, claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2821

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-50 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phares(5,420,482) cited by applicant in IDS in view of Ge(5,859,508).

Regarding Claims 1-40, Phares discloses a microcontroller(60) as a processor for controlling the amount of electrical current supplied to the illumination display comprised of light elements(48R, 48B, 48G) which generate light of a range of colors(e.g. red, green, blue) to illuminate the object.

Phares, as discussed above, essentially discloses the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose the light elements as LEDs. However, Ge teaches that LED devices offer couple advantages in illumination display such as cost efficient, less complexities, etc.(See Col. 1, lines 25-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use LED element as taught by Ge in Phares's illumination display in order to attain those advantages.

Art Unit: 2821

In addition, since Phares fails to limit the choice from all kind of light element, the implementation of such LED is not restricted.

Phares, as discussed above, essentially discloses the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose the specific usage as claimed such as positioning the system to affect an aquarium, illuminating the floor, affect an informational board, etc. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Phares' invention to illuminate any object in order to provide brightness to the observer on the object. Since Phares fails to limit the choice of all kind of usage, the implementation of such specific usage is not restricted.

Regarding Claims 41, 42, 43 and 44, in best understood, Phares discloses the lighting system comprising a driver(94R, 94B or 94G) as a current sink coupled to the light elements(48R, 48B or 48G) (See Figure 4 of Phares) having an input responsive to an activation signal from the control(40); transmitter(64) as an addressable controller having a Logic Control network(76) for providing alterable address, the controller coupled to the input and having Pulse Generator(80) as a signal generator for generating the activation signal for a predefined portion of a timing cycle(See Col. 3, lines 18-26 of Phares); the addressable controller further comprising an internal shift register means as a receiver for receiving data corresponding to the alterable address(See Col. 3, lines 57-60 of Phares) and indicative of the prefined portion of the timing cycle(See Figure 1 and Col. 4, lines 4-23 of Phares).

Phares, as discussed above, essentially discloses the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose the light elements as LEDs. However, Ge teaches that LED devices offer couple

Art Unit: 2821

advantages in illumination display such as cost efficient, less complexities, etc.(See Col. 1, lines 25-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use LED element as taught by Ge in Phares's illumination display in order to attain those advantages.

In addition, since Phares fails to limit the choice from all kind of light element, the implementation of such LED is not restricted.

Phares, as discussed above, essentially discloses the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose the specific usage as claimed such as positioning the system to illuminate a non-opaque container, or vending machine. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Phares' invention to illuminate any desired object in order to provide brightness to the observer from the object. Since Phares fails to limit the choice of all kind of usages, the implementation of a such specific usage is not restricted.

4. Claims 45-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitch(5,912,653) in view of Ge et al.(5,859,508).

Fitch discloses an LCD system controlled by microprocessor(22) mounted on a clothing means(10), comprising a sensor or receiver(68) that is capable of recording and replaying data, and displaying video or programmable image(See Figure 6 and Col. 3, lines 17-39)..

Fitch, as discussed above, essentially discloses the claimed invention but fails to show an LED system, however, Ge teaches that LED devices offer couple advantages over LCD such as cost efficient, less complex, etc.(See Col. 1, lines 25-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious

Art Unit: 2821

to one of ordinary skill in the art to use LED element instead of LCD element as taught by Ge in Fitch's invention in order to attain those advantages(Also see Fegley cited in pto-892).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Fegley et al.(4,054,814) teaches light emitting diodes offer several advantages including greatly reduced power consumption, less burn hazard, much longer life, high reliability and reduce maintenance. Nishizawa et al.(4,329,625) discloses a LED display means emitting colors of red, yellow, and green (blue). Havel(4,686,425) discloses a multicolor display device comprising LEDs.

Correspondence

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Wilson Lee whose telephone number is (703) 306-3426.

7. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



DAVID VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

WL
September 26, 2000